

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

106th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 69

March 25, 1999, 6:01 p.m.
Page S-3386 Temp. Record

BUDGET RESOLUTION/Higher Taxes, More Spending on Community Programs

SUBJECT: Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 2000-2009 . . . S.Con. Res. 20. Reed motion to waive the Budget Act for the consideration of the Reed amendment No. 162.

ACTION: MOTION REJECTED, 49-50

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S.Con. Res. 20, the Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 2000-2009: will cut the debt held by the public (money that the Federal Government owes to creditors other than itself) in half over 10 years; will fully fund Medicare (all of the President's proposed \$9 billion in Medicare cuts were rejected; as a result, this budget will allow \$20.4 billion more in Medicare spending over the next 10 years); will save the entire \$1.8 trillion in Social Security surpluses over the next 10 years for Social Security; will provide for \$778 billion in net tax relief over the next 10 years (in contrast, the President's budget would increase the tax burden by \$96 billion net over 10 years), and will adhere to the spending restraints (discretionary spending caps and pay-go provisions) of the bipartisan budget agreement as enacted in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and the Taxpayer Reform Act of 1997 (the President's proposed budget, in contrast, would dramatically increase spending in violation of that bipartisan agreement, and would result in \$2.2 trillion more in total Federal debt at the end of 10 years than proposed in this Senate budget).

The Reed amendment would strike \$64.224 billion of the proposed tax relief in order to increase proposed spending on function 450 (Community and Regional Development). Total budget authority for this function would be increased by \$88.7 billion, and outlays would be increased by approximately \$64 billion. The amendment would break the budget agreement by resulting in total Federal spending above the spending caps.

After debate, Senator Domenici raised a point of order that the amendment violated section 305(b)(2) of the Budget Act. Senator Reed then moved to waive that section for the consideration of the amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to waive favored the amendment; those opposing the motion to waive opposed the amendment.

NOTE: A three-fifths majority (60) vote is required to waive the Budget Act. After the failure of the motion to waive, the point

(See other side)

YEAS (49)			NAYS (50)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (4 or 7%)	Democrats (45 or 100%)		Republicans (50 or 93%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans (1)	Democrats (0)
Chafee	Akaka	Kennedy	Abraham	Helms	McCain- ²	
Collins	Baucus	Kerrey	Allard	Hutchinson		
Jeffords	Bayh	Kerry	Ashcroft	Hutchison	EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE: 1—Official Business 2—Necessarily Absent 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Announced Yea AN—Announced Nay PY—Paired Yea PN—Paired Nay	
Snowe	Biden	Kohl	Bennett	Inhofe		
	Bingaman	Landrieu	Bond	Kyl		
	Boxer	Lautenberg	Brownback	Lott		
	Breaux	Leahy	Bunning	Lugar		
	Bryan	Levin	Burns	Mack		
	Byrd	Lieberman	Campbell	McConnell		
	Cleland	Lincoln	Cochran	Murkowski		
	Conrad	Mikulski	Coverdell	Nickles		
	Daschle	Moynihan	Craig	Roberts		
	Dodd	Murray	Crapo	Roth		
	Dorgan	Reed	DeWine	Santorum		
	Durbin	Reid	Domenici	Sessions		
	Edwards	Robb	Enzi	Shelby		
	Feingold	Rockefeller	Fitzgerald	Smith, Bob		
	Feinstein	Sarbanes	Frist	Smith, Gordon		
	Graham	Schumer	Gorton	Specter		
	Harkin	Torricelli	Gramm	Stevens		
	Hollings	Wellstone	Grams	Thomas		
	Inouye	Wyden	Grassley	Thompson		
	Johnson		Gregg	Thurmond		
			Hagel	Voinovich		
			Hatch	Warner		

of order was upheld and the amendment thus fell.

Those favoring the motion to waive contended:

We are very concerned that this budget resolution proposes deep spending cuts in community and regional development programs. Those programs have been helping our urban and rural communities make great progress in recent years. Urban areas in particular have been doing well in large part to the infusions of Federal funds from these development programs. One very clear sign of their effectiveness is that the crime rate has been declining in many major cities. That decline is not just attributable to Republican mayors cracking down on crime--it is also due to efforts to rebuild and revitalize inner city communities. Many of the programs involved give money as block grants, with very few strings attached. As a result, local innovation is encouraged and the funds are spent with greater results. We are not offering this amendment to eliminate the proposed tax relief in this resolution. Even after the passage of this amendment very large tax cuts will still be possible within the budget. We are only asking our colleagues to make the continued progress of our urban and rural communities an equal priority. We urge our colleagues to join us in waiving the Budget Act for the consideration of the Reed amendment.

Those opposing the motion to waive contended:

The bottom line of this amendment is that it would increase spending for regional and community development programs by increasing total spending rather than by finding room for it within our \$1.7 trillion and growing annual budget. We will not support such an increase. Over the next 10 years, the budget will run surpluses and we will have a prosperous economy, thanks in large part to successful Republican efforts to balance the budget by cutting spending. In total, the Federal Government is going to collect nearly \$900 billion more in taxes (not counting the Social Security surplus) than it is scheduled to spend under the spending caps. Our Democratic colleagues would dearly love to spend that extra money rather than live within the budget. We think that it is a better idea to stick by our budget and give back most of the excess taxes we are going to collect. When Federal, State, and local taxes are combined, Americans are already being taxed at the highest rate in history. We should be reducing that tax burden rather than trying to increase total Federal spending. Americans do not need more Federal assistance when the economy is roaring ahead, but they do need tax relief when they are being taxed at record-high rates. Therefore, we strongly oppose the Reed amendment.